

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

I would like to see more professional and objective news-programming. Also, if a program such as the anti-Kerry program should be aired, then it should be required that, either a pro-Kerry or an anti-Bush program be aired as well, on the same terms. Showing only one side, does NOT serve public interest.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. I would be delighted to assist in shaping policy for media programming in the public's best interest.

Sincerely,
-Robert